



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sherman's quarrel with Stanton about the terms that he entered into with Johnston is treated with much more moderation, as it deserves to be ; but the vindication of the Secretary of War is no less complete.

About one-half of the second volume is devoted to the period of Reconstruction. Here the author has given too much space to general questions and to quoting from reconstruction documents where concise and careful summaries are the most that are needed. When Stanton takes up the long and bitter struggle with Johnson the story increases in interest and value, and much new material and original comment are contributed. The author seems to us to attribute too many of the acts of Johnson and of the ex-Confederate leaders to conspiracy and not enough to a perfectly natural prejudice against the negro and Federal interference. Likewise there were more prejudice and anger on the part of Stanton and the men who shaped Congressional reconstruction and tried to get Johnson out of the White House than is admitted.

As a defence of Stanton the work is a great success, but there seems to be room to doubt if it will make Stanton popular. The reasons for this are that the narrative is too long for the length of Stanton's career, and that there has been no attempt to make a careful and frank analysis of Stanton's character and traits in their weakness as well as in their strength. If the author would condense these octavo volumes into one and would give more space to a consideration of Stanton's peculiarities, he would spread the fame of his hero and win the popularity that he himself has already earned by his serious undertaking. Stanton deserves to be very prominent among a score of the greatest of our national heroes.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

War Memories of an Army Chaplain. By H. CLAY TRUMBULL, formerly Chaplain of the Tenth Regiment of Connecticut Volunteers. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. x, 421.)

THIS is an interesting and valuable work, not primarily historical in aim yet casting upon the history of the Civil War a good deal of important light. The author's experiences covered nearly the entire period of the war, and were extremely varied and characteristic. His service lay in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida. He was in many battles, among them some of the bloodiest, in several Confederate prisons, for a time in solitary confinement out of suspicion that he was a spy. This personal record is as entertaining as can be ; parts of it are thrilling. Much space is devoted to revelations of soldiers' character and morals, the author thinking with Archbishop Ireland, who during the war was chaplain to the Fifth Minnesota regiment, that "a chaplain can write much better than any one else about the inner spirit of armies." We do not consider this true. A chaplain cannot become familiar with the soldier's worst character or doings. He only sees the best phases. The best phases are, however, instructive, and no other writer, save Rev.

J. William Jones, for the Confederates, has portrayed them quite so well as Mr. Trumbull does. But if the soldiers of the Union army were as a class perhaps less deeply concerned with religious ministrations than our author seems to suppose, they certainly do not deserve the dreadful condemnation which he has pronounced on them on p. 177. "General Washington said truly that while there were soldiers who were controlled by a desire for glory or by a high sense of patriotism, so that they could be depended on for going into action as a matter of duty or of honor regardless of selfish considerations, *the great majority of men* were held to their places as soldiers by their knowledge that the danger of running from the front was greater than that of moving forward in battle line. *This was as true of the soldiers of the Union army in our Civil War as of Continental troops in the War of the Revolution*" (italics ours). Such a judgment about the "majority" of soldiers is an insufferable exaggeration. If Washington really wrote as alleged, the traditional view that he found mendacity impossible is disproved. If "the great majority" of soldiers do not in battles think any too much of glory or of patriotism pure and simple, it is slanderous to allege that they are kept in line by bare fear of running away. Mr. Trumbull was, of course, simply nodding when he wrote this passage, for nearly every page of his book refutes it.

Two or three points of more technically "historical" importance are set forth in these *Memories*. One of them is brought out in Chapter VIII., on "Deserters and Desertions," where it is made clear how the high bounties paid for substitutes as the war advanced conduced to desertions. Men entered the service for money, deserted, and then enlisted again for more money, and so on. "In single regiments one-fourth, and again one-half, and yet again a larger proportion, of all the men assigned under a new call of the President for 500,000 more volunteers, deserted within a few weeks of their being started to the front." Soldiers remember that after having long and vainly applied the death penalty as a means of checking desertions, our government, late in the war, changed policy, offering immunity and honorable discharge to all deserters then actually in service who should confess their crimes and agree faithfully to serve out their terms. The result was good, proving that many deserters were brave men who had simply been swept off their feet by the spirit of greed so rife among civilians at home. Mr. Trumbull appears to have been the author of this change in the method of dealing with deserters. When severity multiplied rather than lessened the number deserting, he reasoned that the new deserters were probably old deserters led by the executions to fear that their turn would come next. This surmise—undoubtedly correct—Chaplain Trumbull communicated to Lt. Col. Goodyear, from whom, through Gen. Ord, it was reported to Washington, resulting in President Lincoln's proclamation of March 11, 1865, in the tenor indicated above.

Trumbull's *Memories* help to a dispassionate view of the treatment accorded Federal prisoners in Confederate prisons; and such a view will

differ considerably from that formed by most Northern people during and immediately after the war. Most of the principal prisons were certainly horrible places, cramped, dirty, unsanitary; the diet was bad and meagre; many of the keepers were cruel. That all the sufferings of Union soldiers in these pens were due to the Confederacy's poverty alone can never be shown. For all this, as the *Memories*, Chapter XI., reveal, Southern citizens and Confederate officers and men not only showed kindness to Federal prisoners, but often went out of their way to do this. The worst inflictions were due to "the caprices of their enlisted men, volunteers or conscripts, sometimes coarse, ignorant, and even brutal in spirit and conduct, who were on guard in charge of us, and even the officers themselves were at times compelled to carry out orders from those above them which they could not but regret. The Confederate prisoners on the floor above us were even more severely dealt with than ourselves." When nigh to death from innutrition in the Columbia prison Mr. Trumbull himself was supplied by a neighboring hotel-keeper with the food to which alone he attributes his recovery, the donor refusing to take a cent in payment.

The *Memories* furnish pleasing proof how common loyalty to the Union was at the South during the war. The author declares that he was never for any length of time in a company of Confederates without hearing expressions of tender regard for the old flag, and of hope that the Federal cause would win. In most sections a large minority, in some a majority, did not wish secession, and not a few even of those who voted for it did so with the most obscure and vague ideas of its meaning. Numbers of such Unionists were forced into the Confederate service notwithstanding, and fought with real bravery and with apparent zeal for the cause which they detested. The history of the war in this aspect can never be very fully written, since so many carried their loyalty as a sweet secret till death in battle or in hospital forever sealed their lips; so that students should make the most of such testimony in the matter as does in one way and another emerge.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS.

The War with Spain. By CHARLES MORRIS. (Philadelphia: The J. B. Lippincott Co. 1899. Pp. 383.)

Our Navy in the War with Spain. By JOHN R. SPEARS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xxii, 406.)

The Cuban and Porto Rican Campaigns. By RICHARD HARDING DAVIS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. viii, 360.)

In Cuba with Shafter. By JOHN D. MILEY, Lieutenant-Colonel and Inspector-General, U. S. Volunteers, First Lieutenant, U. S. Artillery. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xi, 228.)